

James R. Canfield, CA Bar No. 32437
1150 North First Street, Suite 219
San Jose, CA 95112
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 967
San Jose, CA 95108
(408) 993-8472
(408) 993-8475 (fax)

Attorney for plaintiff

E-filing

FILED
00 MAR 14 PM 1:14
NICHARD W. WILKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MEJ

LAVJINDER SINGH,

Plaintiff,

v.

EMILIO T. GONZALEZ, Director
U.S. Citizenship & Immigration
Services
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Office of the Chief Counsel
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Room 4025
Washington, DC 20536

Defendant.

CV

08

1454

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Administrative Procedure Act Case
Civil Rights Case

Civ. No.

INTRODUCTION

1. This action is commenced to require the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") to approve Mr. Singh's Application for Employment Authorization, Form I-765. This form must be approved while an Application for Adjustment of Status to Lawful Permanent Resident, Form I-485, is pending. On November 13, 2007 when Mr. Singh's Application for Employment Authorization was denied, his Application for Adjustment of Status to Lawful Permanent Resident had not yet been fully adjudicated and was therefore still pending. Specifically, Mr. Singh had not been allowed to plead his case before an Immigration Judge and

1 therefore the USCIS' decision regarding his application for Adjustment of Status to Lawful
2 Permanent Resident was not final. Due to the lack of finality, which judicial review provides,
3 the USCIS was statutorily compelled to approve Mr. Singh's Application for Employment
4 Authorization until an Immigration Judge reviewed the USCIS' denial of Mr. Singh's application
5 for Adjustment of Status.

6 2. This action is also brought to enjoin the USCIS from refusing to refer cases to the
7 Immigration Courts in order to avoid judicial review of its arbitrary and capricious decisions,
8 thereby leaving Mr. Singh and others similarly situated in legal limbo, without any applicable
9 statute of limitations, until the USCIS decides, on its whims, to refer the case to the Immigration
10 Courts for removal proceedings.

11 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12
13 3. This court has jurisdiction pursuant to the 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because it presents a
14 federal question.

15 4. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e). The
16 plaintiff resides within the Northern District of California.

17 5. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c) and (d), assignment is appropriate in the San Francisco
18 division because plaintiff resides in this district and no real property is at issue in this action.

19 6. There is a present and actual controversy between the parties to this action. A
20 declaration of the correct implementation of the legal requirements described in this complaint is
21 necessary and appropriate to determine the respective rights and duties of the parties to this
22 action.

23 7. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. Defendant has a clear, mandatory and
24 ministerial legal duty to administer its immigration system in a manner consistent with
25 applicable laws. Plaintiff will suffer from irreparable harm due to the failure of defendant to
26 comply with applicable laws.

27 8. Plaintiff has exhausted any and all administrative process set forth by the USCIS. No
28 administrative procedures exist that plaintiffs must exhaust.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

9. Plaintiff's application to adjust status has been denied because he was determined to be inadmissible. Therefore, he may not remain in the United States. Nevertheless, however, no affirmative steps are being taken to deport or remove Mr. Singh from the United States. Mr. Singh thus faces a Catch-22: He may either voluntarily depart and leave his wife, children, family, employment, way of live and adopted country of eighteen years all while foregoing his right to present his unusual circumstances to an Immigration Judge; or Mr. Singh may continue to illegally reside in the United States with the daily, continuous fear of being removed with no possibility for repose. This action seeks to eliminate this potentially infinite legal limbo so that Mr. Singh's immigration status may be determined once and for all. Mr. Singh asks the court to compel the USCIS to approve Mr. Singh's application for Employment Authorization until his matter is adjudicated by an Immigration Judge in removal proceedings.

10. Defendant USCIS has a practice of referring denials of Applications for Adjustment of Status to the Immigration Courts for further proceedings. To wit, the Immigration Courts determine the removability of the alien and order deportation if necessary.

11. In the San Francisco district, defendant USCIS illegally and unconstitutionally refrains from referring denials to the Immigration Courts. The USCIS does so in order to avoid review of its decision by the Immigration Courts, thereby eviscerating the checks and balances system envisioned by the forefathers and implemented by Congress in the INA.

12. Defendant USCIS' acts are contrary to the procedural safeguards guaranteed by the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and the statutory scheme of the INA.

13. The USCIS appeal mechanism is non-existent or purports to review de novo; however, this mechanism is inadequate. The lack of judicial oversight allows arbitrary and capricious decision to go unchallenged.

14. Plaintiff has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law other than the relief requested in this complaint. Unless enjoined by this court, the USCIS will continue to engage in arbitrary and capricious decision-making with no oversight and contrary to law.

PARTIES

15. PLAINTIFF Lavjinder Singh is a citizen of India who immigrated to the United States, specifically California, in 1990. He has continually resided here since and has faithfully followed the laws of the United States and California since his arrival.

16. DEFENDANT USCIS is a public entity organized and existing under the laws of the United States. Pursuant to the Constitution, defendant USCIS has a duty: 1) to follow the laws of the United States; and 2) not to infringe upon the rights of individuals under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

STATUTORY SCHEME

17. The Immigration and Naturalization Act (the "Act"), enacted under Congress's plenary powers, decides the fate of millions of immigrants hoping to better their way of life in these United States.

18. Section 245A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. section 1255(a), allows for an adjustment of status of nonimmigrant to that of person admitted for permanent residence. This statute allows "[t]he status of an alien who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States . . . may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if (1) the alien makes an application for such adjustment, (2) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence, and (3) an immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is filed." 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a).

19. If the petition is denied, "[n]o appeal lies from the denial of an application by the director, but the applicant, if not an arriving alien, retains the right to renew his or her application in proceedings under 8 CFR part 240." 8 CFR § 245.2(a)(5)(ii).

20. Further, for "[a]ny alien who has filed a completed legalization application pursuant to section 245A of the Act (and part 245a of this chapter)," an "Employment authorization shall be granted in increments not exceeding 1 year during the period the application is pending

(including any period when an administrative appeal is pending) and shall expire on a specified date.” 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(22). The Code of Federal Regulations specifies classes of aliens who must apply for employment authorization. “If authorized, such an alien may accept employment subject to any restrictions stated in the regulations or cited on the employment authorization document. BCIS, in its discretion, may establish a specific validity period for an employment authorization document, which may include any period when an administrative appeal or judicial review of an application or petition is pending.” 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c).

21. If, however, an alien is not considered admissible under Section 245A of the Act, Congress shifts jurisdiction to the Immigration Courts. Specifically, “[i]n the case of any alien who has been placed in deportation proceedings or in removal proceedings (other than as an arriving alien), the immigration judge hearing the proceeding has exclusive jurisdiction to adjudicate any application for adjustment of status the alien may file.” 8 C.F.R. § 1245.2(a)(1)(i). This explicitly removes jurisdiction from the USCIS because the “USCIS has jurisdiction to adjudicate an application for adjustment of status filed by any alien, unless the immigration judge has jurisdiction to adjudicate the application under 8 CFR 1245.2(a)(1).” 8 C.F.R. § 245.2.

22. Any denials of an application for Employment Authorization may then be renewed in removal proceedings. 8 C.F.R. § 245.2(a)(1).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

23. In December 1990, Mr. Singh entered the United States.

24. On August 14, 1999, Mr. Singh married Mandip Kaur, a United States citizen.

25. Mr. and Mrs. Singh have two children together, both born within the United States and within wedlock.

26. On February 20, 2001 Mr. Singh filed an I-130 petition classifying him as the spouse of a United States citizen.

27. On September 19, 2001 Mr. Singh was interviewed regarding his application. At this time, he stated that he first entered the United States without inspection near San Diego in

1 December 1990. Immediately thereafter, Mr. Singh corrected his testimony to state that the
2 entered the United States in San Francisco in December 1990. Specifically, he used a fraudulent
3 passport and visitor visa but subsequently applied for legalization and was paroled unto the
4 United States in July 1997.

5 28. This admission made Mr. Singh inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the
6 Act, 8 U.S.C. section 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).¹

7 29. On December 27, 2001 Mr. Singh filed a waiver of inadmissibility based upon the
8 extreme hardship that would be levied upon Mr. Singh's citizen spouse if Mr. Singh were
9 removed from the United States. A mere ten days later, on January 7, 2002, the USCIS denied
10 Mr. Singh's application.

11 30. On February 7, 2002 Mr. Singh appealed the denial of the waiver to the
12 Administrative Appeals Office, which dismissed the appeal on April 2, 2004.

13 31. On July 14, 2004 the USCIS denied Mr. Singh's Application for Employment
14 Authorization, Form I-765, due to his ineligibility for the benefit.

15 32. On August 16, 2004 the USCIS denied Mr. Singh's Application for Status as a
16 Lawful Permanent Resident, Form I-485, because the USCIS failed to issue Mr. Singh a waiver
17 for his classification as inadmissible.

18 33. This denial of Mr. Singh's Form I-485 was not referred to the Immigration Courts for
19 removal proceedings.

20 34. On August 2, 2007 Mr. Singh filed an Application for Employment Authorization,
21 Form I-765.

22 35. On November 13, 2007, Mr. Singh's Application for Employment Authorization,
23 Form I-765, was denied. The USCIS stated that since Mr. Singh's Application to Register
24 Permanent Resident or Adjust Status, Form I-485, was denied on August 16, 2004 he did not
25 have a pending application for adjustment of status and he was therefore ineligible for
26

27 ¹Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks
28 to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other
29 documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided
under this Act is inadmissible.

1 employment authorization.

2 36. Till date, the USCIS has not referred Mr. Singh's file to the Immigration Court for
3 further proceedings even though he was found inadmissible over three and a half years ago.

4 37. Mr. Singh's departure would force his citizen spouse to re-locate to India--the
5 country to which Mr. Singh would be deported--because of their strict religious and community
6 beliefs that bar both divorce and separate habitation of spouses.

7 38. Mr. Singh's spouse has no family ties outside the United States. Her husband, father,
8 mother and all siblings reside in the United States. Specifically, Mr. Singh's spouse has no
9 connections or ties with India. Indeed, she has never even been to India.

10 39. Mr. Singh's departure will result in a catastrophic financial impact upon his spouse if
11 she were to stay in the United States. She has not been employed since July 2002 and she and
12 her two young children wholly depend upon Mr. Singh for financial support.

13 40. Mr. Singh's spouse was certified as a medical office specialist in 1999, after having
14 attended school for eight years in order to complete the two-year program. She has not,
15 however, ever worked as a medical office specialist and the skills she acquired during her
16 schooling have atrophied and become outdated over the past nine years.

17 41. Mr. Singh's spouse suffers from multiple health conditions. Specifically, she suffers
18 from significant hearing loss in both ears and frequent breaks her bones. Due to her hearing loss,
19 it is virtually impossible for her to work as a medical office specialist, the only job for which she
20 has training. This virtually guarantees that she will become a ward of the state upon Mr. Singh's
21 departure.

22 42. Mr. Singh's spouse has to take off her hearing aid at night time. This requires the
23 presence of Mr. Singh by her side through out the night time to avoid any emergency or
24 accidents

25 43. Mr. and Mrs. Singh have no financial safety net in India and would be entering
26 Indian society at the bottom-most economic rung. Therefore, without money or a job, it will be
27 impossible for Mr. Singh's spouse and her two American-born children to attain suitable medical
28 care since India has no form of health insurance and all health related treatments must be paid for
29

1 upfront and in full.

2
3 **PLAINTIFF's FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 **(Violations of the Administrative Procedures Act)**

5 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs as if set forth fully
6 herein.

7 45. The APA allows for the appeal of final agency decisions that are not discretionary. 5
8 U.S.C. §§ 704, 701(a)(2).

9 46. According to the USCIS, the denial of Mr. Singh's application for Employment
10 Authorization is final and non-appealable. However, an Application to Adjust Status is non-
11 final, and therefore pending, until it has been reviewed by an Immigration Judge in removal
12 proceedings.

13 47. The USCIS does not have discretion when determining the fate of an application for
14 Employment Authorization submitted when an Application to Adjust Status is pending. 8 C.F.R.
15 § 274a.12(c)(22).

16 48. By denying Mr. Singh's Employment Authorization application while his
17 Application to Adjust Status was pending, defendant USCIS violated the INA, abused its
18 discretion, and acted arbitrarily and capriciously and not in accordance with the law, in violation
19 of the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 706.

20
21 **PLAINTIFF's SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

22 **(Violations of the Fifth Amendment)**

23 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs as if set forth fully
24 herein.

25 50. The Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that the Federal
26 Government shall not deprive any person "of life, liberty, or property, without due process of
27 law." The selective treatment of Mr. Singh, whereby the USCIS refuses to place him in removal
28 proceedings in order to avoid judicial review, amounts to the deprivation of life, liberty, and
29

1 property without due process of law.

2 51. The USCIS appeals mechanism, where applicable, purports to provide de novo
3 review of USCIS decisions, however, the mechanism does not do so adequately, thereby
4 allowing for its arbitrary and capricious decisions to stand.

5
6 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**
7

8 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully request that this court grant the following relief:

- 9 1. Declaring unlawful and setting aside the USCIS decision dated November 13, 2007
10 that denies Mr. Singh's Application for Employment Authorization, Form I-765,
11 because he purportedly does not have a pending Application to Adjust Status.
- 12 2. Ordering the USCIS to grant Mr. Singh's Application for Employment
13 Authorization, Form I-765, until Mr. Singh's Application to Adjust Status is
14 reviewed by an Immigration Judge in removal proceedings.
- 15 3. Declaring the USCIS' practice of refusing to refer cases to the Immigration Courts
16 in order to avoid judicial review of its decisions to be arbitrary and capricious, and
17 not in accordance with the INA, the APA and the Fifth Amendment of the United
18 States Constitution.
- 19 4. Awarding plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees for this action under the Equal Access
20 to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d) and 5 U.S.C. § 504 et seq.
- 21 5. Granting plaintiff such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

22
23 DATED: March 5, 2008

24 Respectfully submitted,

25
26 By, 
27 JAMES CANFIELD

28 Attorney for Plaintiff
29

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO.)

I.(a) PLAINTIFFS

SINGH, LAVJINDER

DEFENDANTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, DIRECTOR,
EMILIO T. GONZALEZ

**(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)**

ALAMEDA

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)













James Canfield, Attorney-At-Law
1150 N 1st Street, # 219, San Jose, CA 95112, Ph: 408-993-8472

ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN 'X' IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 3 Federal Question
(U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 4 Diversity
(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN 'X' IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF
(For diversity cases only) AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Citizen of This State |  1 |  1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State |  4 |  4 |
| Citizen of Another State |  2 |  2 | Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place of Business In Another State |  5 |  5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country |  3 |  3 | Foreign Nation |  6 |  6 |

IV. ORIGIN

(PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- ☒ Original Proceeding
 ☐ Removed from State Court
 ☐ Remanded from Appellate Court
 ☐ Reinstated or Reopened
 ☐ Transferred from Another district (specify)
 ☐ Multidistrict Litigation
 ☐ Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

V. NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

CONTRACT		TORTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury		PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury Med Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth In Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 RR & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Satellite TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions
			LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl.Ret. Inc. Security Act	SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (US Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609	
	REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS			
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer w/ disab - Empl <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer w/ disab - Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motion to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition				

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE US CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY)

For Declaratory and Injunctive relief by this Court under Administrative Procedure Act

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

JURY DEMAND: ☐ YES ☒ NO

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY PLEASE REFER TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 CONCERNING REQUIREMENT TO FILE "NOTICE OF RELATED CASE"

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2)

(PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

☒ SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND

☐ SAN JOSE

DATE _____

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

3/10/2008

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD
[Signature] *[Signature]*

Court Name: U.S. District Court, NDCA
Division: 3
Receipt Number: 34611016991
Cashier ID: bucklem
Transaction Date: 03/14/2008
Payer Name: law offices of mahesh bajori
a

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: lavjinder singh
Case/Party: D-CAN-3-08-CV-001454-001
Amount: \$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: 1310
Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00
Total Tendered: \$350.00
Change Amt: \$0.00

mej

Checks and drafts are accepted
subject to collections and full
credit will only be given when the
check or draft has been accepted by
the financial institution on which
it was drawn.